TAXPAYER REFUND ACT/Pension Plan Mandate

SUBJECT: Taxpayer Refund Act of 1999 . . . S. 1429. Harkin motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the Harkin amendment No. 1454.

ACTION: MOTION REJECTED, 48-52

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S. 1429, the Taxpayer Refund Act of 1999, will give back to the American people \$792 billion of the \$3.3 trillion in surplus taxes that the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has projected that the Federal Government will collect over the next 10 years. The projection is based on assumptions of 2.4-percent average annual growth in the economy, no growth in discretionary spending after 2002, and entitlement spending growth as required under current law. Approximately \$1.9 trillion of the surpluses will be Social Security surpluses (Republicans have been attempting to defeat a Democratic filibuster of a proposal to protect those surpluses from being spent; see vote Nos. 90, 96, 166, 170, 193, and 211). After protecting the Social Security surpluses and providing tax relief of \$792 billion, \$505 billion will remain for additional spending or debt reduction. The average growth rate over the past 50 years has been 3.4 percent. The current growth rate is around 4 percent. If the 3.4-percent average rate is maintained for the next 10 years, then (using the CBO rule-of-thumb chart from Appendix C of the January 1999 Economic and Budget Outlook) the surplus will be roughly \$4.9 trillion, not \$3.3 trillion. Key tax relief provisions include that the bottom tax rate will be lowered to 14 percent and expanded (providing \$297.5 billion in tax relief over 10 years) and the tax burden on families will be cut (providing \$221.7 billion in tax relief). Tax relief will also be given to encourage saving for retirement, to make education and health care more affordable, to lower death taxes, and to lower taxes on small businesses.

The Harkin amendment would prohibit the conversion of any defined benefit pension plan for 100 or more employees to a cash balance plan if such a conversion did not meet new mandates regarding the amounts paid into the accounts for older employees.

All votes after vote No. 233 were on amendments or motions that were made after all debate time had expired. However, 2 minutes of debate were allowed before each vote by unanimous consent, some statements were inserted in the record, and some amendments and motions were debated prior to being offered or made. Senator Thompson raised a point of order that the motion

(See other side)

YEAS (48)				NAYS (52)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (3 or 5%)	Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (52 or 95%)		Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)	
Grassley Jeffords Specter	Akaka Baucus Bayh Biden Bingaman Boxer Breaux Bryan Byrd Cleland Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Durbin Edwards Feingold Feinstein Graham Harkin Hollings Inouye Johnson	Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Kohl Landrieu Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Lincoln Mikulski Moynihan Murray Reed Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Schumer Torricelli Wellstone Wyden	Abraham Allard Ashcroft Bennett Bond Brownback Bunning Burns Campbell Chafee Cochran Collins Coverdell Craig Crapo DeWine Domenici Enzi Fitzgerald Frist Gorton Gramm Grams Gregg Hagel Hatch	Helms Hutchinson Hutchison Inhofe Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Nickles Roberts Roth Santorum Sessions Shelby Smith, Bob (I) Smith, Gordon Snowe Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Voinovich Warner		EXPLANAT 1—Official I 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	nced Yea nced Nay Yea	

VOTE NO. 245 JULY 30, 1999

violated section 305 of the Budget Act. Senator Harkin then moved to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the amendment. Generally, those favoring the motion to waive favored the amendment; those opposing the motion to waive opposed the amendment. NOTE: A three-fifths majority (60) vote of the Senate is required to waive the Budget Act. After the failure of the motion to waive, the point of order was upheld and the amendment thus fell.

Those favoring the motion to waive contended:

Many companies in America that offer pensions are switching from defined benefit plans to cash balance plans. We have no problem with them making that switch if they do it fairly. Some companies are not doing it fairly. They are degrading the value of the pensions of their older workers. The Harkin amendment would stop that practice. We urge our colleagues to support this amendment.

Those opposing the motion to waive contended:

Employer sponsorship of defined benefit pension plans has been declining over the last few years, mainly due to the increased regulatory burden that Congress and the Internal Revenue Service have placed on employers who offer these plans to their employees. The Harkin amendment would make that burden much greater by substantially impairing an employer's ability to design or change a plan to meet the changing needs of the business and its employees. In addition, it would punish good corporate citizens who maintained pension plans while leaving other companies free to terminate their plans in order to escape the application of this new law. This bill will enact more expansive disclosure requirements in order to deal with the problem of plan participants not knowing or understanding changes to their pension plans. It would not place new limits on those plans, though. Congress should focus on revitalizing the defined benefit pension system rather than on further destroying it by adding new burdens on employers who voluntarily establish such plans. Therefore, we urge our colleagues to oppose this amendment.